CBS MEMORANDUM

FROM: Meg Clarke
TO: MR. FUCHS cc: Mr. Drasnin
DATE: June 8, 1976

Mr. Drasnin asked me to forward the attached comments to you in his absence.

If there's anything else you'd like as refutation of Mr. Latham's observations, please call.

M.C

COMMENTS ON LATHAM ARTICLE:

The camera crew did film the corn fields planted for the geese, the ponds, and the management activities, and the film was used. Apparently you weren't watching at the time. The narration used with those film segments dealt with the hunter's role in conservation and the need for management, as well as a description of the Pymatuning operation. To refresh your memory, the script explained: "This is a management area for waterfowl in Pymatuning, Pennsylvania. The state game department created a permanent home for thousands of ducks and geese raised here. It is also a feeding ground for thousands more migrating south each year . . . and a hunting ground for the Pennsylvania sportsman. In autumn, there are estimated to be forty-thousand ducks and geese in Pymatuning. Management works."

There were some management practices we didn't mention --the fact that the shooting in the controlled areas is restricted to Mondays, Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays, as the Game Commission explains: "This leaves every afternoon and three days for the geese to feed unmolested. Consequently, they stay in the area longer." ("The Pymatuning Story," published by the Pennsylvania Game Commission.) About the corn you mentioned, we didn't point out its primary purpose -- acting as a lure: "It was discovered, as previously noted, that geese could not be lured into a refuge simply by hanging out refuge signs around its perimeter. Many attractions for geese had to be incorporated first . . . vast fields of grasses and grains were the primary tool for persuading a migrating gaggle of geese to stop . . .," as the Game Commission's pamphlet explains.

Concerning the limit of geese at Pymatuning, the Game Commission considers it significant: "To provide more sport to more hunters, the federal limit of two geese is further reduced in this county (Crawford) to one goose." ("The Pymatuning Story") I suppose if we had not mentioned the limit, we would have been accused of suggesting that there is no limit.

In regard to the shooting starting a half hour before the legal starting time, it happened that way, as anyone who was there, as you were not, would be able to tell you. It is curious that you argue that it just couldn't be true because of game protectors breathing down a hunter's neck every minute. Is it only the fear of getting caught that keeps a hunter from shooting before starting time? In any event, it is questionable whether there were enough game officials to oversee that many hunters in that large an area, or anywhere else. That's why poaching, among other abuses, is so widespread a problem in the U.S., as the law enforcement division of the Interior Department or any state game department can verify.

You might be interested in the experience reported by a Michigan waterfowler in November 1975. He had been upset by the broadcast, but later reconsidered his views. He reported what happened when he went hunting at Lake St. Clair: "We approached our duck blind at 6:30 a.m.; absolute darkness prevailed. The legal shooting hours were 7:45 a.m. to 7 p.m. In the darkness we could not believe the shooting that was going on one hour and 15 minutes before the legal hour." Pymatuning seems not to be an isolated occurence.

There were no "special" shots; no one was asked to perform in any way. The particular incidents cited in your article happened exactly as depicted in the broadcast.

You are right about one thing. Open garbage dumps are illegal in Michigan. We never said anything about the legality of garbage dumps. The subject of the broadcast was not waste disposal. We did say that it is not against the law in Michigan to shoot bears in a dump. The hunters at the dump were not discouraged in any way by the Department of Natural Resources official who was at the scene where the filming was taking place. He did make sure the hunters understood just what the legal starting time was.

You seem upset by the inclusion of the segment of bear hunting with dogs. You maintain that such a practice is uncommon. I refer you to Mr. Ben East, one of the co-plaintiffs in the MUCC suit. His book was one of our sources for background information regarding bear hunting. According to this "dean of Michigan ourdoor writers," as you characterize him: " . . . a few states with a substantial bear population (New York among them, with a plentiful supply in the Adirondacks) continue to prohibit the use of dogs in hunting bears. Repeated attempts to legalize that method have failed, blocked by worried deer hunters who argue, honestly but mistakenly, that bear hounds would run all the deer out of the country." He continues: "Next to hunting with hounds, the most productive way to hunt the black bear is to bring him to the gun by baiting." (Excerpts from The Ben East Hunting Book.) Mr. Erwin Bauer, another name you should recognize, agrees with Mr. East: "Next to hunting over bait, the most common method of pursuing black bears is with hounds, usually a pack of them." (North American Big Game Hunting) You might also consult Pierre Pulling, who wrote Game and the Gunner, published by Winchester Press. He reports that many places have no restrictions against chasing bears with hounds, and it's a practice he recommends.

You also bring up the question of states limiting the number of hunters who hunt together. The Pennsylvania big game regulations in force at the time the broadcast was filmed do specify that no more than 25 hunters can hunt deer together at the same time. The regulations don't mention similar restrictions with regard to bear hunters. According to the script, there were 20 - 30 men involved in the bear hunt, which sounds similar to legal maximum numbers for Pennsylvania deer hunting.

The inference you draw from the inclusion of a sign advertising "License-Liquor-Ammunition" is a bit far-fetched. You might consider a campaign to prohibit anyone who sells hunting licenses and ammunition from selling liquor, or vice versa. It's not too far-fetched to say that it probably wouldn't be a very popular campaign, except perhaps in anti-hunting

circles. In any case, the fact is that such signs were common.

As to the old timer, he wasn't the only one who voiced the opinion that the deer herds had been subject to overkill. Several other hunters made the same statement. And the deer harvest statistics don't prove the old timer wrong. In the Salina-Richfield area, also known as Herd Unit 45, the record is: in 1972 a success ratio of 77% for 1,520 hunters; in 1973 a success ration of 50% for 720 hunters; and in 1973 a success ratio of 35% for 927 hunters. We asked the state game department why this had happened. The department didn't deny the decline, and did offer a reason. As we said in the script: "State game officials say that's because of an unusually severe winter the year before." So, the old timer disagrees with the game department. Do you suggest that he does not have that right? In addition, the man was eighty years old, had lived on a ranch in the area for twenty years, and was in charge of registering hunters for the "Big Buck" contest.

Mr. Latham, isn't it you who should be more than a little embarrassed -- at your lack of accuracy, your failure to substantiate any of your accusations and innuendos, and at your failure to observe and honor even the minimum standards for responsible reporting.

Drosnin
35/10

Irv:

I can answer this, but perhaps you already have dealt with the Latham column, or would like to make some comments on it before I do.

Dave

D Fl Cuke –
I Think you ought to
write Lot Jones ... a copy to
the writer of this letter MD

Dear Sir: May 9, 1976

I am enclosing a clipping from todays Pittsburgh Press. I think this article pretty well sums up the hunters opinion of "The Guns of Autumn". As for me, I agree with the hunters but I'm more concerned about the televisions ability to twist any documentary to suit its own purposes. It's about time that the viewing public had some say in what is being sent over our air waves.

A lot of other people and I are going to keep a close watch on your coverage of the Presedential campaign to see what candidate your pushing for. I hope the hunters win their suit, it might put the TV industry in its place. Thanking you for your consideration and I would appreciate hearing from you on the merits of this article.

Sincerely Yours
Edgar H. Shonkel

118 W. Woodland Dr.
Aliquippa, Pa. 15001

Taking Another Shot At

Great Outdoors
By Roger Latham
Outdoors Editor

It is anybody's guess how the $300 million lawsuit brought by the Michigan United Conservation Clubs against the Columbia Broadcasting System will be resolved.

But one thing sure, CBS knows by now that the hunters of this nation were insulted by the television film "Guns of Autumn." They were insulted, not only by the inferences contained in the film's strange depiction of hunting in America, but by the underhanded way in which CBS secured the footage.

At its last meeting in late March, the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs sent a check to MUCC for $1000. Money is being donated by sportsmen's clubs and angry hunters from everywhere. Some time ago, $30,000 had been received at the Michigan organization's headquarters and more is arriving daily.

In April, U.S. District Court Judge Noel P. Fox of Grand Rapids issued an order allowing both sides to take depositions and to have 45 days after that to prepare for the beginning of the trial. Judge Fox ruled that CBS should not destroy any of the unused sound track involved in the production of the "documentary."

Sportsmen far and wide object to the term "documentary," since the film, according to them, depicted almost no "normal" hunting activities. Hunters accuse CBS of selecting only bizarre hunting situations, participated in by a comparative handful of individuals.

Co-plaintiffs with MUCC are five prominent Michigan outdoorsmen. These are: Rep. Thomas J. Anderson, Southgate, chairman of the House Conservation Committee; Carl T. Johnson, Cadillac, member of the station Natural Resources Commission; Fred Bear, Grayling, world-famed bowhunter; Ben East, Holly, dean of Michigan outdoor writers, and Thomas L. Washington, MUCC executive director.

As time goes on, more and more evidence comes to light about how game departments and individuals were duped, lied to, and made to look like fools.

The Pymatuning Goose Management Area sequence shot right here in Pennsylvania was typical of the whole unsavory procedure.

A girl made the original contact with the Pennsylvania Game Commission and told officials that CBS intended to make a hunting documentary. The camera crew took footage of the corn fields planted for the geese, the ponds, the nesting boxes and all the other management activites and devices and then never used a foot of this film.

In fact, I wonder whether there was

Outdoor Queries

2 thru 9 & PW $1[illegible]

'The Guns Of Autumn'

even film in the cameras!

The statement was made in the film that shooting started a half hour before shooting time. As anyone who has been lucky enough to have a permit for a goose blind at Pymatuning on the first day will tell you that this is just not true. There is a game protector breathing down your neck every minute.

And the film talked about the limit, as if this were some great thing. The limit is one goose per man. It would be difficult to have it lower than that!

There were "special" shots of a man stoning a crippled goose and another standing on the neck of another cripple. It must have taken quite a bit of glib talking to get the "actors" to perform this service. This in no way is normal hunter behavior.

Remember the bears at the garbage dump in Michigan?

First off, garbage dumps are illegal in Michigan. Second, garbage dump bears are extremely dangerous to foolish camera nuts and to others who attempt to feed them by hand. The U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service and the state park agencies try to discourage this in every way possible and consider a garbage dump bear a real nuisance.

Most states do not permit hunting bears with dogs. Most states do not permit more than a limited number of hunters to hunt together. And finally, any hunter who would shoot more than once at a bear in a tree is a mighty poor hunter.

In other words, the whole thing was obviously "staged." I cannot believe that real hunters would not compromise themselves before the camera in this manner.

The western deer hunt was next and practically nothing shown was normal.

A sign with the words "License Liquor - Ammunition" was evidently meant to infer that the hunter regularly mixes gunpowder and alcohol. They do not. In all my experience as a game protector and a hunter I have seen only one person out hunting who was obviously "alcohol happy."

Licenses are normally sold at sporting goods stores, county treasurer's offices and local offices of the various state wildlife agencies.

An investigation was made of the old timer who stated that the deer had all been killed off. The state's deer harvest figures would prove his statement to be false. Also, it was found that he had not been hunting for 12 years. Obviously, another "plant."

The lawyers and officers of MUCC are leaving no stone unturned and predictions are that the trial is going to be very interesting. They have talked to every principal in the film, every game department and the owner of the shooting preserve where the deer was shot repeatedly with a .22 pistol.

There is every reason to believe that CBS is going to be more than a little embarrassed!

and who [illegible] Rambling Afield

CBS
NEWS

A Division of CBS Inc.
524 West 57 Street
New York, New York 10019
(212) 765-4321

Robert Chandler, Vice President, Administration
and Assistant to the President

Dear Mr. Sutherland: October 7, 1975

I have your intemperate letter.

Since you do not indicate what you consider to be "gross distortions, deliberate misrepresentations, scurrilous journalism and outright lies," it is difficult to reply.

I am enclosing an eight-page rebuttal to the more specific criticisms lodged against "The Guns of Autumn," and I am enclosing copies of Irv Drasnin's replies to Fred Servey and Glenn Bowers.

The answer to your question about whether there was one experienced hunter in the crew which produced filmed and edited "The Guns of Autumn" is yes.

Yours very truly,

Robert Chandler

Mr. Robert E. Sutherland,
Member
Pennsylvania Game Commission
811 W. 30th Street
Erie, Pennsylvania 16508

bcc I. Drasnin

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION

MEMBER
ROBERT E. SUTHERLAND
811 W. 30TH STREET
ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA 16508

CBS/AU

1975 SE 25 11 06

9/15/75

Vice-President in charge

CBS News

Dear Sir:

I was pressnt when Mr. Drasnin and his crew filmed material at the Pymatuning Waterfowl Propagation Area in Pennsylvania. I saw what they shot. I heard what they were told; and I saw what they did to that material when they put together "The Guns of Autumn."

Your newsmen were guilty of gross distortions, deliberate mis-representations, scurrilous journalism and outright lies. The publicity material released in advance of airing was equally distorted.

Was there one experienced hunter in the entire crew which produced, filmed and edited "The Guns of Autumn?"

I do not expect your reaction program to be any more honest. You have shown your disdain for either accuracy or honesty. Your newsmen are not newsmen. They are prostitutes.

Robert E. Sutherland

Robert E. Sutherland,
Member
Pennsylvania Game Commission

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA GAME COMMISSION

MEMBER
ROBERT E. SUTHERLAND
811 W. 30TH STREET
ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA 16508

October 17, 1975

Mr. Robert Chandler
Vice President, Administration
CBS NEWS
524 West 57th Street
New York, New York 10019

Dear Mr. Chandler:

Sorry, I did send you an intemperate letter. The treatment Pennsylvania hunters and the Pennsylvania Game Commission and its personnel received at the hands of Mr. Drasnin touched off the explosion. Now the specifics.

I am a member of the Pennsylvania Game Commision, an eight-member, unpaid, groupe of men representing various divisions of the state. I represent nine counties of Northwestern Pennsylvania, including Crawford county in wich the Pymatuning Waterfowl Management Area is located.

I am executive news director of WJET-TV, Channel 24, Erie Pa., an ABC affiliate. I have held that position for nine years, since the station went on the air. Prior to that, I was editor of the Erie Times-News, a 90,000 circulation Sunday Newspaper published by the Times Publishing Company of Erie, Pa., which also publishes two dailies in Erie. I have roughly 35 years experience in newspaper, radio and television news. With this preamble, I ask your indulgance in what may be a long, but not intemperate letter.

I am disturbed by the amount of time expended in "The Guns of Autumn" on big game hunting. Except where "regular" state licenses include big game hunting, that type of hunting is not the sport of the "average" hunter.

The "average" hunter hunts rabbits, upland game birds, waterfowl, maybe doves, maybe raccoon, maybe squirrels. If his "regular" license allows him to hunt deer, bear, or turkey as they do in Pa., he probably will. If he

gets a deer, or a bear, or a turkey, he will be the exception, not the rule.

The great majority of hunters will never shoot on a commercial shooting presearve. They can't afford it and most of them don't care for that type of "fish in the barrel" hunting. To that extent, "The Guns of Autum" was a "gross distortion" of the average hunter.

The eight page disclaimer CBS/Broadcast Group mailed out under the signiture of Majorie Holyoak is inaccurate in its reference to Pymatuning. It states: "There is no limit on the number of hunters on adjacent 'privately owned' land." There are three adjacent duck-hunting areas on land owned by the Pa. Game Commision limited to a maximum of fifty hunters per area. Obviously we have no control over privately owned land. In actuality, the owners limit the number of goose hunters.

Your Statement: "The hunting methods used at Pymatuning are common to all wartefowling, regardless of location or numbers of hunters." Untrue.

Hunting at Pymatuning, for ducks or geese, is allowed only on Mondays, wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays during the respective seasons. Hunting is from sunrise to noon only, no later. Hunters in goose blinds are limited to ten shells. Hunters may take only one goose. Hunters fortunate enough to get into a blind at Pymatuning, may not shoot there more than once in a given season. These are uncommon methods.

Your statement: "Filming at this location gave us the opportunity to present some of the basic points of game management as explained by hunters themselves and their spokesmen." That is seeking accuracy about as much as asking viewers to present the basic points of CBS News programing.

Your crew was at Pymatuning the day before the opening of waterfowl season. They had an opportunity to show the land management aspects of thei area and its by-products of non-game birds and animals which attract hundreds of thousands of non-hunters annually. They filmed hunting violations (Shooting before the actual opening hour) but they ignored the enforcement officers issuing citations to early shooters.

Twenty-five years age, the Pymatuning area was nothing, worthless, marginal land. Water impoundments established

wetlands. Land managmentimproved the arable portions. Forty pairs of Canada Geese formed the initial flock which now numbers thousands. Birds hatched at Pymatuning return there to nest. Migrants are attracted. The annual kill stays under fifteen percent, guaranteeing that even under the hunting pressure of other states the Pymatuning flocks will continue to grow.

These points of progress were written off in the "Guns of Autumn" by a quip equating the harvesting of geese with the harvesting of corn. Incidentaly I watched your crew filming the sequences in the goose blinds. I would like to see them again. Ibelieve the sequences were "hoked up" in the editing.

I accused CBS News of deliberate misrepresentation. I repeat the accusation. Irv Drasnin is a liar. He told me and others at Pymatuning, before, during and after the filming, that his objective in producing "The Guns of Autumn" (that name was never mentioned) was to present, in his own words, "a poor man's "American Sportsman." He said he wanted to show an honest portrayal of waterfowl hunting. He did not do it.

I defy you to find a free, public waterfowl hunting facility to compare with Pymatuning. It was grossly maligned.

As far as the specifics of deliberate misrepresentation and scurrilous jornalism: In your eight-page rebuttal, this statement: "References or hunters' statements concerning game managment and conservation include these:

"A Hunter: "Nature's way is actually cruel. And the ultimate death of most anamils comes cruelly, eather via predation or starvation or some form of disease, in nature. The hunter's way is actually quite humane." If I recall this sequence correctly, this voice was super-imposed over a film sequence of two hunters swinging and hurling a deer carcass into a pick-up truck. Deliberate juxtaposition? I'm certain of it.

I have never seen a sign advertizing Guns, Ammo, and Alcoholic Beverages. Drasnin did; was it used because it was typical?

A lot of people connected with the Game Commission and a lot of thoughtful hunters are concerned about showing the "true side" of hunting. Unfortunately, most of them believe that films of a hunting sequence should not show

the game being killed. I disagree. Their approach is as distorted and inaccurate as Mr. Drasnin's. There is an honest version of "The Guns of Autum." You didn't produce it and, under present conditions the hunters probably wouldn't either.

Mr. Chandler, I apologize for the intemperate attitude of my initial letter. I would like to make this offer with no strings, just to put you in a "typical" Pymatuning hunter's shoes. Come to Pymatuning as my guest. Bring a hunting friend. Make it a Monday, Wednesday, Friday or Saturday during the Pa. Goose season which opened (for Pymatuning) October 17. A true hunter, who has hunted Pymatuning once will die happy. He has had the ultimate hunting experience.

Regards,

Robert E. Sutherland
Member
Pennsylvania Game Commission

RES/ms

CBS MEMORANDUM

FROM: Irv Drasnin
TO: BOB CHANDLER
DATE: October 7, 1975

Enclosed are copies of my letters to Mr. Fred Servey, the Pennsylvania Game Commission official who accompanied us at Pymatuning, and to Mr. Ray Sickles, who manages the waterfowl management area. Their letters to me are also enclosed.

Sutherland was also present at Pymatuning the day we filmed. He was the one who urged Meg Clarke (at the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs Convention in Harrisburg last year) to film Pymatuning as "a terrific place" to film waterfowl hunting. We had every reason to believe that the Commission and the sportsmen's federation considered Pymatuning to be a positive example of waterfowl hunting in America.

Since his charges lack specificity, though not vehemence, a specific answer is difficult. As for his question, however, the answer is yes: both Billy Wagner, the cameraman, and Jimmy Liu, the assistant cameraman, have hunted. (But, as you know from my cover memo to the background papers, I consider this question irrelevant.)

It is all right with me, should you consider it useful, to make either or both of my answers to Servey and Sickles, available to Sutherland. If I can be helpful in any other way, please let me know.

PS -- I'm also enclosing a letter from the executive director of the Pennsylvania Game Commission, Mr. Bowers, and my response.

Dear Mr. Sutherland:

Mr. Chandler has asked me for my comments on your letter of 17 October 75 regarding the coverage of the Pymatuning Waterfowl Management area included in "The Guns of Autumn." I take strong exception both to the specifics and to the tone of your complaint. Specifically:

1. You state that "the great majority of hunters will never shoot on a commercial shooting preserve." That may or may not be true but whatever the future of hunting may be, NEVER STATED OR IMPLIED THAT THE MAJORITY DO USE PRESERVES. "The Guns of Autumn." The broadcast stated specifically that "Not every hunter will go to a preserve but hundreds of thousands do use preserves of all kinds and their number is growing." Not mentioned in the broadcast is that in 1970 -- the last year such figures were compiled -- hunters spent more than $17½ million in daily entrance and privilege fees in commercial shooting preserves. Regardless of what your personal feelings may be about preserves, they exist -- many of them in the state of Pennsylvania -- and they are popular with hunters. They are reported on and recommended in the outdoor press, are regularly advertised in the outdoor magazines, are listed in the NRA Hunting Annual and represent a significant

part of the contemporary hunting picture in America. On no journalistic ground would it have been excusable to ignore them and [redacted] to do so would indeed be a "gross distortion."

You further state that "They (hunters) can't afford it (preserves) and don't care for that type of hunting." While we do not presume to speak for all hunters, you apparently do. Your claim is disputed by the facts. Furthermore, the hunters we filmed in a preserve stated their belief that it is less expensive to spend one or two days in a preserve than one or two weeks in the "wild" and that this economic consideration was one reason they used preserves.

2. You refer to an inaccuracy in Ms. Holyoak's letter, ~~cite Ms. Holyoak's letter as inaccurate~~ quoting it as stating: ~~saying that it states:~~ "There is no limit on the number of hunters on adjacent "privately owned' land." In fact, the inaccuracy is yours. The letter states, correctly, that "There is no limit on the numnber of hunters on adjacent land." There is no reference to private land. The letter refers to the public hunting areas located around the Pymatuning Reservoir and Propagation Area where there is [redacted] no limit on the number of hunters; these are uncontrolled areas in contrast to the controlled areas you mention. We do not know what restrictions, if any, are placed on the use of private land by the owners in that area since we did not film on any private land there.

3. Sutherland draft

3. You claim that the statement "The hunting methods used at Pymatuning are common to all waterfowling, regardless of location or numbers of hunters" is untrue, but you say nothing to support that claim. The hunting procedures you cite for the regulated areas at Pymatuning are rules governing what can be shot and when. They are regulations, not methods, (the way men hunt waterfowl). As stated in the letter, "the use of blinds, of decoys, of calls, and of retrieving dogs" are in fact the methods for hunting common waterfowl regardless of location or numbers of hunters. The regulations in force at Pymatuning may be common or uncommon but in fact the broadcast cited the daily and seasonal bag limits. Furthermore, for the record but not in the broadcast, one game department official told us that one reason the shooting days are staggered is so the waterfowl will not be scared away from the area, so they will be there to be hunted another day.

4. Sutherland Draft

4. I fail to understand why you think that presenting "some of the basic points of game management as explained by hunters themselves and their spokesmen" indicates a lack of intention to seek accuracy. You apparently believe that hunters and their spokesmen are ignorant, or at least inaccurate, on the subject of hunting and game management. Among our sources are the book Game Management by Aldo Leopold, and the Wildlife Management Institute as well as state game departments and hunters themselves. Do you suggest that there are better sources, more reliable spokesmen on the subject of game managemrnt; that these sources are not competent?

5. For the record, my camera crew was at Pymatuning the afternoon before the waterfowl season opened and so was I; you were not, and therefore you do not know what we saw and filmed. In fact, the pictures taken that afternoon were used in the broadcast to explain the basic points of the hunter's relationship to conservation including the fact that the land is used by many non-hunters and that the numbers of some species have increased as a result of that relationship. But the broadcast was not about non-hunters or non-game birds and animals; it was about man, the hunter, in contemporary America.

Again, for the record, the film crew did not "ignore the enforcement officers issuing citations to early shooters." We were witness to the issuance of only one such citation and that occurred while the camera crew was moving into position

to film hunters in an uncontrolled hunting area, some distance away from where the citation was being issued. No mention was made to us by any of the Game Department officials with whom we had contact of any other citations issued for early shooting~~? and given the ratio of game department personnel to hunters there was, in any case, no effective way to police such violations.~~

You refer to the use of Pymatuning as a breeding and nesting ground for waterfowl as if that were not mentioned in the broadcast. It specifically was mentioned. (We didn't mention, however, that controlled hunting areas and the uncontrolled Hartstown area are stocked with ducks from the propagation area specifically for the hunting season.)

None of these points regarding the hunter and game management were, as you suggest, "written off," and it was in no way suggested that these practices endanger the survival of any species, game or non-game. What you take to be a "quip" regarding the harvesting of wildlife as if it were corn, or any other crop, is in fact a serious analogy used repeatedly by game management spokesmen and by hunters and their spokesman. The analogy is not CBS', it is the hunter's own. It is the language of game management. For example, in his book, Game Management, Leopold states:

indent

"Game management is the art of making land produce sustained annual crops of wild game for recreational use." And, "hunting is the harvesting of a man-made crop which would soon cease to exist if somebody somewhere had not, intentionally or unintentionally, come to nature's aid in its production."

The analogies for crops used by advocates of hunting and game management in discussions with us included corn, wheat, trees and other "renewable resources."

6. You state that you "watched the camera crew filming the sequences in the goose blinds." I must remind you that you "watched" at a distance from which it was impossible for you to see either the camera crew, the hunters or what was taking place in or out of the goose blind. Neither were you present in the editing room. That sequence, like the rest of the Pymatuning sequence and every other sequence in the broadcast was not, as you believe, "hoked up." What is in the broadcast is what happened, and how it happened.

Since you recklessly choose to repeat your accusation of "misrepresentation," I will again deny it. The broadcast was never represented to be anything other than what it is: a look at hunting and the hunter in America today, without celebrities or armchair partisans, described as much as possible in the words of ordinary hunters, a[redacted] In that sense [redacted] it could be described as an

7. Sutherland draft

"American Sportsman without celebrities." ~~It was never described out of context~~ That description however was never used out of context and it was made clear that it was a news documentary being made by CBS News. As is almost always the case, ~~there was during production no idea of what the documentary would be titled~~ the title of the broadcast was chosen only after production was completed -- just as news documentaries are not pre-scripted, they are not pre-titled. We hadn't gotten the story yet. The story, as we found it -- whether at Pymatuning, in Utah and Colorado, in Michigan or Arizona -- is an honest and factual report of what we found and filmed.

7. You base your charge of "scurrilous" journalism on two scenes totaling about thirty seconds of an eighty-minute film. You choose to ignore that a great number of hunter's statements were used over a great variety of pictures, many of which showed hunters alone or in small groups, on foot, on horseback, in camps, describing why they hunt. One of those pictures showed two hunters swinging a deer carcass into the back of a pick-up truck, a technique which we saw repeated many times. You ignore the totality of the broadcast. ~~You reveal your perceptions to be those not of a newsman but of a game commissoner, an advocate of hunting interested in presenting only one side of the story, the side that suits your purposes as a partisan. I am a reporter, not a partisan.~~ It is not the role or responsibility of CBS News to take a positive or a negative view of any subject but to present the facts as we find them, fairly and as completely as possible. That also applies to your objection to the sign advertising "guns, ammo and alcoholic beverages." That sign

was neither filmed at nor shown in connection with Pymatuning, but in Utah or Colorado where such advertising is quite common or, if you will, typical. There was a sign at the corner of Route 322 and the road to Pymatuning which we saw and filmed at a cafe, but which we did not use. It advertised: "Hunting and Fishing Licenses, Ammo and Guns for Sale, Breakfast." As a I recall from my days many years ago as a reporter in the Pittsburgh bureau of United Press International, alcoholic beverages in Pennsylvania are obtainable only at package stores. I do recall also Mr. Sutherland who offered me a drink within the Pymatuning area the day we filmed the hunting of waterfowl! I also saw alcoholic beverages in other hunting locations, but we neither filmed nor broadcast any hunters either drinking or drunk during a hunt, nor did we imply in any way that any were.

Mr. Sutherland, your perceptions and your apology do not go far enough. Your role as a game commissioner and avocation as a hunter blind you to the role and obligations of the journalist. Your charges are without substance or substantiation. As a spokesman of the Pennsylvania Game Commission you are entitled to your point of view and to publically advocate that point of view. It is the role of the journalist to be a reporter, not a partisan. I find your confusion of these roles and your reckless language inexplicable and indefensible.

Sincerely,

Your last letter was a bit more temperate, but it was a bit lengthy. I would like to answer some of the major points you raised.

You state that the great majority of hunters will never shoot on a commercial shooting preserve, can't afford it and most don't care for that type of hunting. "The Guns of Autumn" never stated or implied that the great majority of hunters do patronize preserves. The narration did state that "Not every hunter will go to a preserve, but hundreds of thousands do use preserves of all kinds, and their number is growing." Regardless of your personal feelings about shooting preserves, that remains a fact and not a gross distortion of the average hunter. I might also point out that the shooting preserve is recommended in the outdoor press as an ideal learning ground for the novice hunter; preserves are advertized every month in the outdoor magazines, are listed in the NRA Hunting Annual, and account for millions of dollars spent by hunters in daily entrance and privilege fees. The preserve is an integral part of the contemporary hunting scene in America, and as such, is a necessary part of any report on that subject. To ignore the shooting preserve would indeed be a gross distortion.

You refer to an inaccuracy in the eight page response letter sent by Marjorie Holyoak. Unfortunately, Mr. Sutherland, the inaccuracy is yours. You quote the letter as stating: "There is no limit on the number of hunters on adjacent 'privately owned' land." In fact, the letter states: "There is no limit on the number of hunters on adjacent land." The letter refers to the public hunting areas located around the Pymatuning Reservoir and Propagation Area and there is in fact no limit on the number of hunters in those sections.

You further charge that the statement "The hunting methods used at Pymatuning are common to all waterfowling, regardless of location or numbers of hunters" is untrue. Your refutation takes the form of a discussion of the regulations for hunting in the controlled areas of Pymatuning, and you conclude by saying that these are uncommon methods. WHETHER THEY ARE UNCOMMON OR NOT, ~~They may be uncommon, but~~ they are not methods, they are regulations. If you had read the CBS statement accurately, you would have noted the reference to the methods (i.e. the ways of hunting) being discussed: "the use of blinds, of decoys, of calls, and of retrieving dogs." If your contention is that these methods are uncommon, then you must discuss methods, not regulations.

I do not understand why you think that presenting "some of the basic points of game management as explained by hunters themselves and their spokesmen" indicates a lack of intention to search for accuracy. To so claim would indicate a belief that hunters and their spokesmen are ignorant, or at least inaccurate, on the subject of game management. Are you saying that hunters are not competent to speak about hunting or game management? Who would you suggest?

To set the record straight, the film crew did not ignore "the enforcement officers issuing citations to early shooters." There was only one such citation issued ~~that~~ OF WHICH we were aware ~~of~~. It occurred while the crew was moving into position for filming in the public hunting area. No mention was made by any of the Game Department officials present of any other citations issued for early shooting.

In the Pymatuning section we did discuss the land management aspects of game management in general, as well as the contribution to wildlife conservation: "The modern hunter has a modern reason for his sport and the money that goes

into it. Conservation. A special tax on guns and ammunition is used by the states for the conservation of wildlife. It is also used to buy land. It is true, as claimed, that the land is used in amny ways by non-hunters. It is true that the numbers of some wildlife have increased." We also discussed the operation of the management program at Pymatuning: the raising of ducks and geese, provision of feeding grounds for migrating waterfowl, and hunting facilities for the Pennsylvania sportsman. (We did fail to mention, I admit, the stocking of Area J, Area L, (controlled) and the Hartstown (public) area with ducks from the propagation area.)These points were not written off, and it was in no way suggested that these practices endanger the continuation of the species. What you referred to as a "quip" equating the harvesting of geese under these conditions with the harvesting of corn, is simply a statement of the objective of game management in it s own language. If that is a quip, it is the hunter's own and one he takes quite seriously.

You state that you watched the crew filming the sequences in the goose blinds. I must remind you that you were watching at a distance from which it would be impossible to see what was going on in that goose blind. That sequence, as is true with every other sequence in the film, was not "hoked up." What is in the film is what happened, and how it happened.

As to your accusation of misrepresentation, since you choose to repeat it, I will again deny it. The film was never represented to be anything other than what it is: a look at hunting and the hunter in America today without celebrities or armchair partisans, told as much as possible in the words of the ordinary hunter, and in that sense, yes, a "poor man's American Spportsman." What is in the film, whether waterfowl hunting at Pymatuning, deer hunting in Utah, bear hunting in Michigan, etc., is an honest portrayal of what was found and filmed.

CBS
NEWS
A Division of CBS Inc.
524 West 57 Street
New York, New York 10019
(212) 765-4321

Dear Mr. Bowers: October 3, 1975

Your letter to the Federal Communications Commission regarding "The Guns of Autumn" has come to my attention. It is filled with assumptions and charges that are not supported either in your letter or in fact.

For the record, however, there was no misrepresentation regarding the purpose or intention of the broadcast either at Pymatuning or anywhere else.

For the record, no scenes anywhere in the broadcast were "rigged" or staged; and the statements on game management used in the broadcast come directly from Aldo Leopold's book, Game Management, or from other game management people.

And, for the record, at no location did any of the hunters consider anything they were doing distasteful or unusual; and no one was filmed without his or her knowledge and permission.

For your information, I am enclosing a copy of a letter being sent to viewers who expressed their criticism of the broadcast in the hope it will answer any specific questions you might have. It should be noted, too, that we also have received a great many letters not critical of the broadcast, including many from persons who have either hunted or still do.

Sincerely,

Irv Drasnin
Producer

Mr. Glenn L. Bowers
Executive Director
Pennsylvania Game Commission
P. O. Box 1567
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

CBS
NEWS
A Division of CBS Inc.
524 West 57 Street
New York, New York 10019
(212) 765-4321

Dear Mr. Sickles: October 2, 1975

While it is impossible for me to agree with your assumptions regarding "The Guns of Autumn," I do welcome your views and I appreciate your taking the time to write.

Specifically, I must take issue with your charges that the broadcast was one-sided or a deliberate attempt to discredit the sport of hunting; that the film was selectively edited to emphasize a negative view of hunting and its consequences for animals; that any part of it was staged; that it was "full of propaganda and trickery;" or that millions of people agree with you about that. No one has successfully challenged the accuracy of the reporting, the integrity of the filming or editing, or the motives behind the broadcast -- because none of those charges is true.

Far from trying to fool anyone, our only objective was to report what we found to be true and to let the hunter speak for himself as to why he hunts and on the benefits of hunting. Almost without exception, the locations selected for filming were recommended to us by either a sportsmen's organization or a state game agency and the basis for ninety percent of the research material for the broadcast comes from those sources and the hunter's own press and literature.

Pymatuning was recommended to us by state game officials attending the Pennsylvania Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs convention in Harrisburg last year. In Game News, published by the Pennsylvania Game Commission, Pymatuning is described as a "well-established model of game management" and the article itself -- while mentioning other uses of the area -- emphasizes its attributes and use as a hunting area. We had every reason to believe that this was a positive example of hunting, and a typical one.

I don't know where you got the idea that the program stated that "managed wildlife areas are only interested in providing more wildlife for hunters to kill." You did not get it from "The Guns of Autumn." What was said in the broadcast, over pictures of Pymatuning, was the following:

> "The modern hunter has a modern reason for his sport and the money that goes into it. Conservation.
>
> A special tax on guns and ammunition is used by the states for the conservation of wildlife. It is also used to buy land.

It is true, as claimed, that the land is used in many ways by non-hunters. It is true that the numbers of some wildlife have increased. But the hunter also needs the land and the wildlife to perpetuate his sport.

There is a modern science for this, developed in America, called game management. This is a management area for waterfowl in Pymatuning, Pennsylvania.

The state game department created a permanent home for thousands of ducks and geese raised here. It is also a feeding ground for thousands more migrating south each year and a hunting ground for the Pennsylvania sportsman.

In autumn, there are estimated to be forty-thousand ducks and geese in Pymatuning. Management works."

In other parts of the broadcast there were specific statements with respect to game management, all of them taken from sources I'm sure you would agree are authoritative: either from the book of Game Management by Aldo Leopold or from the Wildlife Management Institute in Washington. As for conservation, the NRA Hunter's Code of Ethics states that members should "support conservation efforts which can assure good hunting for future generations of America." Others who also support game management freely state that game management and related conservation efforts concentrate upon game species.

At every location we did what any responsible reporter would do. We filmed and reported what we found, as we found it. The hunters seen and heard in "The Guns of Autumn" represent a cross section of Americans professionally, economically and geographically and there is not an inexperienced hunter among them. We attempted to show hunting as the hunter sees it, and experiences it, and we used the hunter's own words in letting him describe the experience. But the broadcast was about that, about hunting, and everything filmed and shown was legal in the state in which it occurred and ethical according to the guidelines of the NRA. They represented the same kinds of hunting methods endorsed and promoted -- month after month, year after year -- in the outdoor press and hunting literature.

There is a debate among sincere men and women as to the function and role of game management, but we did not get into that debate. We merely stated, in its own words, what it is. We also did not go into the extremes and excesses of hunting. If that was our purpose, it would have been easily fulfilled by examining the various forms of poaching (wildlife shot out of season, exceeding bag limits, spotlighting, shooting from roads, etc.) as well as many other practices and consequences of hunting such as the use of tree stands and towers; illegal baiting; the use of vehicles, snowmobiles and aircraft to spot, chase and shoot wildlife; the countless numbers of wildlife wounded and crippled each year and not recovered; the estimated four-million ducks and geese which die of lead poisoning each year; the trespassing and vandalism. None of these was covered or even mentioned in "The Guns of Autumn."

October 2, 1975

Ray, we are well aware of the factual points raised in your letter about the Pymatuning Waterfowl area and we covered some of them in the broadcast. But the subject of the broadcast was hunting, and the focus was on man -- which we tried to put in perspective both historically and anthropologically.

I cannot agree that CBS News is obligated to produce a broadcast on hunting more to your liking. It is the responsibility of CBS News to present neither a positive nor a negative view of any subject, but to report the facts accurately as we find them. That was done in "The Guns of Autumn." That no one has challenged those facts might help to explain personal attacks such as yours, which are without substance and which regretfully do not contribute to a meaningful dialogue on the subject.

I am enclosing a letter being sent to viewers of "The Guns of Autumn" who also have expressed their criticism, which I hope will answer any other questions you might have. I should also point out that we have received a great many letters in support of the broadcast, including many from hunters or persons who have hunted.

Sincerely,

Irv Drasnin
Producer

Mr. Ray M. Sickles, Manager
Pymatuning Waterfowl Area
R. D. 1,
Hartstown, Pennsylvania 16131

Enclosure